

## REMARKS

### STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

According to the foregoing, no claim amendments are filed herein. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented, and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

### REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-3 AND 5-6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER GAI ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,167,445) IN VIEW OF PRAGER (U.S. PATENT NO. 5,838,918)

The rejections of claims 1-3 and 5-6 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Page 2 of the Action states that claims 1-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gai; however, pursuant to the telephone conversation with the Examiner on January 12, 2006, claims 1-3 and 5-6 should be rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Gai in view of Prager.

The Examiner notes that Gai fails to disclose more than one administrator performing separate functions, as recited in independent claim 1. However, the Examiner states that Pager teaches a system in which there are more important actions that only higher-level authority administrators can perform, in comparison to other actions which lower-level authority administrators can perform, citing Prager, column 11, lines 34-42.

Applicants respectfully disagree and believe the combination of Gai and Prager fails to disclose all of the features of independent claim 1. The portion of Prager cited by the Examiner teaches two distinct methods of making templates to implement policies (the push and the pull operations). Using the push operation, an administrator pushes information from a stand-alone template 905, which causes changes to all of the subscribing entities to that template and, therefore, requires a higher level of authority.

In an entirely different method (the pull operation), a completely different template can be made by pulling information to only update the particular template end-point 710 from which the pull was initiated, which would have no impact on the other subscribers to the stand-alone template 905. Therefore, a lower-level of authority is acceptable for an administrator using the pull operation.

Therefore, even though Prager discusses multiple operators with different levels of authority, the reference does not teach or even suggest how upper and standard administrators can work together to first create a setting template and then realize the application rule, as described for the present invention.

In contrast, independent claim 1 clearly delineates a two-part structure of first creating a setting template and then realizing the application rule. Specifically, claim 1 recites an application rule entry/edit unit operated by a second administrator to enter or edit application rules prescribing rules corresponding to the setting template, *entered or edited in the setting template entry/edit unit operated by the first administrator*, which is to be applied to a communication having a specific attribute.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 depend from claim 1 and inherit its patentable recitations. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 also patentably distinguish over the prior art.

## CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No.: 09/853,782

Docket No.: 1081.1118

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 7, 2006

By:

David M. Pitcher

David M. Pitcher

Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501